sided documents and information that the 1 plaintiffs or complainants want to present in 2 3 their direct cases. And we're entitled to 4 more than that. 5 MS. MONTEITH: T don't think 6 that's what we're talking about here, though. I don't think that's what we're talking about 7 8 here. 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. I hear what 10 exactly Ms. Monteith is saying, and I think that we -- I believe, also, that Ms. Wallman 11 is in a different -- a little bit of a 12 13 different category, if I'm understanding this 14 correctly. Her case is going to be broken out 15 from the others, that don't have to involve everybody, every part in this proceeding. 16 17 MR. COHEN: But it involves four of the defendants, Your Honor, so a fair 18 amount of coordination. All of the defendants 19 are in that case. We are not -- this is not 20 a case that's frozen in stone. Ms. Wallman

submitted supplemental evidence three weeks

21

ago. She came up with a new expert last week, if I heard her correctly today. She's maybe not at the end of her experts, so all we're talking about is starting the hearing April 1, working backwards. I don't think January 31st makes any sense for discovery because of the holidays. It could be some time in February, could be the end of February. And what is the rush at this point, as opposed to getting it right?

MR. FREDERICK: Your Honor -

MR. COHEN: Let me finish. We did not come in with a schedule that said we want to do everything in the world. We want a delay. We've agreed to forego depositions. We've agreed to forego interrogatories. We want to get the right evidence, and prepare it in a way that we can have an efficient hearing. We're perfectly happy to talk about the length of the hearing. We don't think it should go on forever. if we do our pretrial work efficiently, the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

trial will be efficient.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FREDERICK: Your Honor, MASN we do stand in a different position for a couple of reasons. There's only one defendant in our case. The issues are very well framed. We've already been through one complaint proceeding against Comcast, where very similar issues were fleshed out by the parties. We've got a situation now where the baseball season is going to begin the beginning of April. We have every interest in having a decision by the Commission done so that people are not going to be denied a fifth baseball season by virtue of Comcast's discriminatory treatment of MASN in the Mid-Atlantic region.

We don't see any reason why we have to be the tail on the case, on the four defendant cases. We'd like to go sooner than whatever you decide for WealthTV, and we're prepared to expedite our process so that that can happen.

1 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what kind of 2 - when do you want to start presenting your 3 case? 4 MR. FREDERICK: We'd like to start 5 by early February. 6 SOLOMON: Your Honor, we're 7 the defendant in three cases, so -8 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir. 9 MR. SOLOMON: I think, and we've assumed that the order that would be followed 10 is simply the order in the caption. And that 11 there has to be some ordering of the cases so 12 that Comcast defendants -- remember, these are 13 all separate complaints filed at separate 14 15 times. And maybe I'm adding too much 16 cynicism, and I realize expedition 17 important, but the fact that one of the six complaints has been pending for 11 months 18 isn't the longest thing that's ever happened 19 in the FCC. And I agree with expedition, but 20 the fact is they were just designated for 21

Your colleague has indicated that

hearing.

| 4 | due process requires a hearing. Whatever |
|----|--|
| 2 | happened that made it take that, take a period |
| 3 | of time in the Media Bureau, we agree that |
| 4 | this case should move at a good reasonable |
| 5 | pace. But it's not an outrageous pace to say |
| 6 | that with a pre-hearing conference in late |
| 7 | November, that the hearing would begin, at |
| 8 | least for the first hearing, that the hearing |
| 9 | would begin, which I think all the WealthTV |
| 10 | defendants are roughly saying that it could |
| 11 | begin around April 1st. |
| 12 | MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor - |
| 13 | MR. LEVY: Your Honor, there's one |
| 14 | additional point that bears mentioning. |
| 15 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Let me hear from |
| 16 | Ms. Wallman first. |
| 17 | MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, it is |
| 18 | the longest thing that's ever happened to my |
| 19 | client with the FCC. And I expect that there |
| 20 | will be a fair amount of coordination among |
| 21 | the defendants as to discovery. And we urge |
| 22 | Your Honor to adhere to the schedule that's |

been proposed by Mr. Levy, whether you do that in series or in parallel.

MR. LEVY: The problem here, Your Honor, is that this isn't the end of the process. I mean, recognize we have to have a hearing, you're going to prepare — there's going to have to be post-hearing briefing. You're going to have to prepare a recommended decision. Then it goes to the Commission. By the time we get relief in this matter, not only another baseball season, but another football season may pass by, as well. And the only way to get this process moving is to start it earlier. The parties are prepared to move expeditiously.

And as I said before, if we can't satisfy our burden expeditiously, then we know what the consequences are going to be. But we are confident that we can persuade Your Honor, put in a preponderance of the evidence, make our witnesses available for cross examination at an early hearing, and ultimately prevail.

NEAL R. GROSS

We would like to see that process begin at the beginning of February, not at the beginning of April or May, because the tail is many months beyond that.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, certainly, I'm very confident in setting it down for on or about April 1st, whatever the first Monday of that week is. And I can go from there. If, in the meantime, you can -- no, I'm not going to say about in the meantime. That's going to be the date to get to go to hearing on this case. All right?

The discovery has got to be completed that means by no later than the end of March. And there's going to be trial briefs. I'll set all this out. And in light of the fact that there is some sworn testimony, and some not sworn testimony, I'm going to require some rather detailed summaries of what the witnesses are going to testify to, so nobody gets taken by surprise. If anybody gets taken by surprise, I will be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | very upset, and I don't see how you I don't |
|----|--|
| 2 | have to tell you this, but you're going to end |
| 3 | up hurting your case more than you are helping |
| 4 | it. But, as I say, I'm not worried about that |
| 5 | happening. Mr. Schonman. |
| 6 | MR. SCHONMAN: Your Honor, at the |
| 7 | risk of beating a dead horse, the Bureau would |
| 8 | strongly urge you to move that schedule up. |
| 9 | April 1 st seems like a very long period of |
| 10 | time between now and then to engage in |
| 11 | discovery, and get exhibits together, and |
| 12 | prepare for hearing. If Your Honor wanted to |
| 13 | start March 1 st , perhaps - |
| 14 | JUDGE SIPPEL: That would be okay |
| 15 | with you. |
| 16 | MR. SCHONMAN: We would prefer |
| 17 | something earlier, but I'm not sure that I |
| 18 | don't think you're ever going to get any |
| 19 | agreement from everybody here. |
| 20 | MR. MILLS: That would not be the |
| 21 | choice of the defendants at all. |
| 22 | MR. COHEN: With all due respect, |

Your Honor, the burden is not on the Bureau 1 with respect to the preparation and 2 the 3 hearing. Ι mean, we have all οf the affirmative witnesses to bring forward, and we 4 5 have to carry on cross examination, and do all 6 the discovery. 7 MR. MILLS: Frankly, I understand 8 9 MR. SCHONMAN: Well, if the Bureau doesn't have the burdens, but the Bureau 10 certainly has an interest in seeing this case 11 12 go forward expeditiously. 13 MR. COHEN: Of course, and the 14 question is, is it a matter of policy is 30 days really the point at which you could say 15 that our proposal, and the proposal starting 16 17 on April 1 doesn't carry that out. I don't think a principal argument could be made with 18 19 respect that that 30 days is the dividing line 20 between expedition and non-expedition. Nobody 21 is talking about a long schedule. We've

already come forward and cut everything back,

April 1, and we'll work expeditiously and in an orderly way to get it done, with a trial date in mind. I think that will help us sit down with some of the Wealth side and figure out a rational schedule in the interim so we don't have to burden the Court with a lot of interim steps. We're grownups, we'll work out our disputes, and we'll show up on April 1st ready to try the case, and there won't be any surprises.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Why is a matter of weeks so important to you? That's what I'm - maybe there's something here that I'm missing.

MR. SCHONMAN: Well, we've been going weeks after weeks, and what we end up doing is moving the whole case forward months then. But what we're trying to do is nail down, number one, how long should discovery be. I think there's some agreement, I think, that there will be some level of discovery

1 here, so how long should that be? 2 All right. We've got the entire month of December, and perhaps the entire 3 4 month of January. 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: You don't have the entire month. You know that. I mean, there's 6 7 holiday season. 8 MR. SCHONMAN: It could go up to the first week in February then. Then if you 9 have three weeks in-between the end 10 11 discovery and the beginning of the hearing in March, that is moving along. The parties are 12 getting all the process to which they are due. 13 14 They're able to finish out their cases and 15 move the case along. We don't have the luxury, I think, of doing a - I don't want to 16 17 say a full-blown hearing. We're going to have a full-blown hearing here, but it's going to 18 19 be on a very concise schedule. 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: I wouldn't call it 21 a full-blown -22 MS. MONTEITH: These are not new

| 1 | issues for the parties. |
|----|--|
| 2 | JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand that, |
| 3 | ma'am. |
| 4 | MS. MONTEITH: These issues have |
| 5 | been before these same parties for some period |
| 6 | of time here, and I truly believe, with all |
| 7 | due respect, that the defendants know what |
| 8 | discovery they need or want. They've had |
| 9 | ample time to think that through, and in the |
| 10 | interest of the Commission, the Media Bureau, |
| 11 | the Enforcement Bureau, we ought to move this |
| 12 | case along as quickly as possible. |
| 13 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm trying to |
| 14 | do that. |
| 15 | MS. MONTEITH: They're not coming |
| 16 | to these issues for the first time on October |
| 17 | 10 th with the Hearing Designation Order, and |
| 18 | the Media Bureau's decision. They've been |
| 19 | living these issues for a fairly lengthy |
| 20 | period of time. We ought to move it along. |
| 21 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it's |
| 22 | litigating the issues. I understand |

everything that you're saying, but it's the litigation of the issues under the APA, that's the thing that I have to wrestle with. I'm sure they're very well aware of what the issues are, and what they think is -- what the outcome should be.

Okay. This is the final one: Ides of March, 15 March. I'm doing that solely as a compromise. I think that April 1st is reasonable, but the Bureau has a public interest in the disposition of this case.

MR. SCHONMAN: 16 March is Monday.

on Monday, the 16th. No, I'm going to start it on Tuesday, the 17th. I think witnesses have to get into town over the weekend, and they have to get a chance to talk to the lawyers. That's one day, so we're going to do at 17 March. If that Tuesday had been the 15th of March, I would have set it down for the 15th. Now, the next question is the close of discovery. Since that's 17 March, we're

| 1 | going to have to close discovery down at |
|----|--|
| 2 | February 20. That means there's nothing more |
| 3 | to do for discovery. |
| 4 | Okay. Now, you say 10 requests |
| 5 | for documents. Those should go out tomorrow. |
| 6 | You can use no? |
| 7 | MR. COHEN: Your Honor, I know the |
| 8 | Media Bureau - |
| 9 | (Simultaneous speech.) |
| 10 | MR. COHEN: We understand the time |
| 11 | frame, we will get them out next week. |
| 12 | JUDGE SIPPEL: And does the other |
| 13 | side agree to expedite on that? I mean, |
| 14 | obviously - |
| 15 | MR. LEVY: Of course. |
| 16 | JUDGE SIPPEL: We're not talking |
| 17 | about privileged documents, attorney/client |
| 18 | privilege, and that type of thing. I'll |
| 19 | review those in camera if I have to, but let's |
| 20 | not do that, please. |
| 21 | MR. LEVY: We will be prepared to |
| 22 | expedite our responses, and we will also get |
| | |

| Τ | out our request next week, if we have |
|----|---|
| 2 | requests. |
| 3 | JUDGE SIPPEL: I hear you. All |
| 4 | right. This should be - |
| 5 | MR. MILLS: Is that December 5 th , |
| 6 | Your Honor, for discovery out by? |
| 7 | JUDGE SIPPEL: 20 February. End |
| 8 | of discovery by 20 - |
| 9 | MR. MILLS: No, no, the document |
| 10 | requests. |
| 11 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Served on. Well, |
| 12 | you give me a date. I mean, if it's going to |
| 13 | be next week, you give me the date you're |
| 14 | comfortable with. |
| 15 | MR. COHEN: December 5, Your |
| 16 | Honor. We're all comfortable with that. |
| 17 | JUDGE SIPPEL: 5 December? |
| 18 | MR. COHEN: Yes. And the parties |
| 19 | will talk about our protective order between |
| 20 | now and then. |
| 21 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Right. Well, you |
| 22 | can submit that at any time. You can collect |

the documents and sit on them until you sign 1 2 a protective order. 3 MR. COHEN: Harder to serve ten, Your Honor, than more. 4 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: Sir? 6 MR. COHEN: Harder to serve ten 7 requests than more actually. 8 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, there you go. 9 Well, you need more time to think about it. You're exactly right. I intend to on these 10 11 proposed findings and conclusions, as far as I'm concerned, it's going to be the normal 12 13 time frame on that. I don't have -- let me see, what is it, 20 days? I usually go 30 and 14 20, but I'll do whatever the rules provide on 15 that. And I'm going to -- as an option, so 16 that it might help move it along, as an option 17 to any party that wants to submit a proposed decision, a proposed - what is this called a recommended decision along with their proposed findings, that's fine with me.

Anything that will make my job -- possibly

18

19

20

21

| 1 | make my job easier. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. SOLOMON: Your Honor, can |
| 3 | ask you a question about the proposed |
| 4 | findings? |
| 5 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir. |
| 6 | MR. SOLOMON: Would those be at |
| 7 | the conclusion of each case, or all at the end |
| 8 | of all the cases? |
| 9 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I really |
| 10 | hadn't thought that through. I don't think |
| 11 | that there's a reason as to why it should be - |
| 12 | well, the earlier I can get it and look at |
| 13 | it, the better it is. So I don't see why |
| 14 | anybody who's completed their case and rested |
| 15 | it, why I shouldn't start counting it from |
| 16 | that point on. Well, I've got to count in, of |
| 17 | course, the availability of the transcripts. |
| 18 | Are you all going to get expedited transcripts |
| 19 | on this? |
| 20 | (Chorus of yeses.) |
| 21 | MR. SOLOMON: So X days from the |
| 22 | close of the record in that part of the case. |

JUDGE SIPPEL: Whatever, yes, yes. I don't see why not, because the sooner I get them -- if I get them staggered it's better, my life is better.

MR. BECKNER: Is it your intention in the hearing to, in effect, have sort of serially an NFL, and I'll just pick the order, an NFL hearing, a MASN hearing, and a Wealth hearing, one after the other?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. Αt this point, because of -- I mean, I'm just coming to this case. I know about the case. The case has been in the office, and I'm aware of the broad span of the case. But my point is that you all are in the best position in terms lining up how these cases can most of expeditiously be heard, and I don't want to hear -- I don't want attorneys courtroom who don't need to be here. all. Do you have any -- now, you all may have different thoughts. I'd look to the Bureau now, Mr. Schonman or Ms. Monteith. Do you

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have any strong feelings for that one way or 2 the other? 3 MR. SCHONMAN: Just one minute, 4 Your Honor. Your Honor, we have no opinion 5 one way or the other. 6 JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. So I'm 7 going to leave that up to you all. I'll put 8 a date certain in the order. And, by the way, 9 my -- with the series of illnesses in the 10 office, I won't have my order out until 11 Monday, but you all know what I'm talking 12 about. And I will get an order out certainly 13 the first of next week, and I will state in there what -- no, I'm sorry. Let me back up 14 15 on that. 16 I want the parties to give to me 17 what basically what the order of proof will be 18 with respect to parties. In other words, who 19 is going to go first, and whether it's going 20 to be segmented from the other cases, or can 21 be. I think you -- obviously, you're the ones 22 that are in a position to do that, and it's in

2 going to make it better. It's going to make 3 it faster, more expeditious. We will consult 4 LEVY: 5 that, Your Honor, as the date gets closer. Unless you think that's a very high priority 6 7 for now, there may be changed circumstances between now and then that would affect the 8 9 outcome, as we see how much evidence there is, 10 and how many experts each party has. 11 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, 12 always a caveat to anything that happens in a 13 trial. And, certainly, if there's cause shown as to why something should be changed or 14 15 modified, I'm open to listening to that. But 16 I'd like to go into this case understanding, 17 and we have -- Ms. Gosse is here. We're going to have a lot of logistical work to do on our 18 19 own end, and we do not have an unlimited staff. 20 MR. MILLS: Your Honor, I have one 21 22 other thing. I assume your order is going to

everybody's interest to do it, because it's

1 set forth in advance of the hearing when the 2 witness lists and summaries -3 JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, yes, you'll have all of it. 4 5 MR. MILLS: -- trial briefs, and all that. 6 7 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sur. 8 MR. MILLS: But I also would ask 9 that we get -- we have some form of expert 10 disclosures and reports so that we get -- the 11 WealthTV case, get the plaintiff's expert 12 reports in advance of when we submit our's so 13 that we know what our experts are going to be 14 addressing. This is not just on remedy, it's 15 on both parts of the case. And we would ask 16 that that be staggered so that our experts 17 know what to address. I think that would be 18 much more efficient. 19 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's a good 20 point. As I said before starting out on this, 21 FRCP 26.B, some subsection in there, in terms

of the discovery you're going to get.

| 1 | MR. MILLS: We just need dates in |
|----|--|
| 2 | the order for the - |
| 3 | JUDGE SIPPEL: But you need the |
| 4 | dates in the order in terms of when. |
| 5 | MR. MILLS: Right. |
| 6 | JUDGE SIPPEL: And is that now, |
| 7 | who wants the priority on that? In other |
| 8 | words - |
| 9 | MR. MILLS: Well, the plaintiffs |
| 10 | have the burden. They should submit their |
| 11 | expert's report first, and then we should have |
| 12 | some period of time before we submit our's. |
| 13 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Or even decide |
| 14 | whether or not you need it. |
| 15 | MR. MILLS: Right. And then |
| 16 | depositions of those all have to has to |
| 17 | happen early enough so that we can take |
| 18 | depositions - |
| 19 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure. |
| 20 | MR. LEVY: Before February 20th. |
| 21 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure. I mean, the |
| 22 | statements under Rule 26, I mean, those are |

| 1 | pretty straightforward. And once that's in |
|----|--|
| 2 | your hands, you should be able to set up for |
| 3 | deposition, but you've got your own expert |
| 4 | telling you how silly it is, or something, you |
| 5 | can ask the questions. Is that okay? |
| 6 | MR. LEVY: Yes, that makes sense. |
| 7 | . JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Is |
| 8 | there anything else? |
| 9 | MR. SCHONMAN: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 10 | JUDGE SIPPEL: And that would be? |
| 11 | MR. SCHONMAN: Earlier we had |
| 12 | discussed at length whether direct testimony |
| 13 | should be in writing or live, and I'm not sure |
| 14 | that we resolved that matter. |
| 15 | JUDGE SIPPEL: We haven't resolved |
| 16 | it ye t. I'm inclined - as I said, my |
| 17 | inclination is, I don't see first of all, |
| 18 | I'm not convinced that I have the power, the |
| 19 | authority to deny somebody the right to bring |
| 20 | in a live witness. I understand that if |
| 21 | everybody agrees to it, I certainly would |

order it, and I'm encouraging it. But, on the

other hand, as I said, Comcast and the defendant parties, that they could put on their case as they see fit. As long as it doesn't delay.

MR. SCHONMAN: Well, the Bureau believes that direct written testimony would be the most expeditious manner of proceeding this case. And I think the rules do contemplate that, so I -

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'll take a look at it, and you take a look at it. I would go -- I agree with you that it would be the most expeditious way, and generally it's the easiest and quickest way. On the other hand, if a good - I hate to say that this way - but if a witness is really prepped, and the lawyer has had a second cup of coffee, or her - whatever it might be, you can put that direct testimony on very quickly. In fact, if you put it on too long, you're doing your -- boy, I'll tell you, you put on a case, direct case without a witness in two minutes, it's

| 1 | going to take two days to cross examine that |
|----------|--|
| 2 | witness because the witness hasn't said |
| 3 | anything. So I the time frame, I think |
| 4 | you're thinking of it in a different context |
| 5 | of a case that's going to be tried. This is |
| 6 | not comparative case, or something like that. |
| 7 | MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor. |
| 8 | JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. I'm |
| 9 | sorry. |
| 10 | MS. WALLMAN: One more thing, if I |
| 11 | may. |
| 12 | JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. |
| 13 | MS. WALLMAN: On the exchange of |
| 14 | expert witness reports, I read Judge |
| 15 | Steinberg's initial scheduling order, I |
| 16 | thought as someomelation thought |
| | thought as contemplating simultaneous |
| 17 | exchange. The staggered exchange is fine with |
| 17 18 | |
| Ì | exchange. The staggered exchange is fine with |
| 18 | exchange. The staggered exchange is fine with WealthTV as long as there's an opportunity for |
| 18 | exchange. The staggered exchange is fine with WealthTV as long as there's an opportunity for us to present rebuttal, if need be, after |